



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/515,057	02/28/2000	Noriaki Miyamoto	35.G2543	8795

5514 7590 02/11/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WALLERSON, MARK E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	4

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/515,057	Applicant(s) Miyamoto et al	
Examiner Mark Wallerson	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 2, 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 17-19, 21-29, 31-33, 37-39, 41-43, and 45-48 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-13, 17-19, 21-29, 31-33, 37-39, 41-43, and 45-48 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2622

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on **12/2/2002**.

2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 17-19, 21-29, 31-33, 37-39, 41-43, and 45-48 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose (U. S. 6,301,013) in view of Bubie et al (U. S. 6,453,078).

With respect to claims 1, 11, 12, 21, 31, 32, 41, 45, and 46, Momose discloses a method of processing an image comprising registering an editing set (parts 42-45 figure 5) to an editing menu (41, figure 5) including plural editing processes (sheet size or magnification-reduction (the

Art Unit: 2622

abstract, lines 7-9, column 11, lines 31-61 and column 14, lines 37-61) designated by a user (column 2, lines 10-16), identifying an editing set selected from the editing menu (figure 8).

Momose differs from claims 1, 11, 12, 21, 31, 32, 41, 45, and 46 in that he does not clearly disclose displaying plural reduced-sized images; selecting at least one image from the plural displayed images, and performing editing processes which correspond to the identified editing set on the selected images.

Bubie discloses displaying plural reduced-sized images (the abstract, lines 1-2); selecting at least one image from the plural displayed images (the abstract, lines 2-8), and performing editing processes which correspond to the identified editing set on the selected images (which reads on printing the images based on a custom layout template) (column 6, lines 9-29), and editing set including layout information indicating information of position to lay the images as designated by the user (column 6, lines 9-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose to display plural reduced-sized images; select at least one image from the plural displayed images, and perform editing processes which correspond to the identified editing set on the selected images. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose by the teaching of Bubie in order to enable multiple different images to be properly sized and positioned when being printed as disclosed by Bubie in column 2, lines 12-14).

With regard to claims 2, 22, and 42, Momose discloses an identifier indicating a set of editing processes are registered (figure 13); displaying plural registered identifiers in the form of a

Art Unit: 2622

list (figure 13), and calling a set of editing processes corresponding to an identifier selected from the list of registered identifiers (figure 13 and column 17, lines 17-52).

With respect to claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 43, Momose discloses the editing processes include layout information (column 12, lines 10-17), image rotation (column 11, lines 46-55), and image enlargement/reduction (column 12, lines 10-40).

With respect to claims 17, 18, 37, 38, 47, and 48, Bubie discloses selecting the images based on the image selection condition of the editing set (column 6, lines 9-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose by the teaching of Bubie in order to enable multiple different images to be properly sized and positioned when being printed as disclosed by Bubie in column 2, lines 12-14).

With regard to claims 13 and 33, Momose discloses a scanner (6).

5. Claims 7, 8, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Bubie as applied to claims 1, 21, and 41 above, and further in view of Ono (U. S. 6,295,136).

With respect to claims 7, 8, 27, and 28, Momose as modified differs from claims 7, 8, 27, and 28 in that he does not clearly disclose the editing processes include image contrast and brightness adjustment. Ono discloses a printer control apparatus which sets various attributes for printing utilizing dialog boxes wherein the attributes include image contrast and brightness adjustment (figure 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2622

the time of the invention to have modified Momose as modified wherein the editing processes include image contrast and brightness adjustment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose as modified by the teaching of Ono in order to improve operator control as disclosed by Ono in column 2, lines 26-33.

6. Claims 9, 19, 29, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Bubie as applied to claims 1, 21, and 41 above, and further in view of Kubo et al (Kubo) (U. S. 5,828,461).

With respect to claims 9 and 29, Momose as modified differs from claims 9 and 29 in that he does not clearly disclose the editing processes include designating an aspect ratio. Kubo discloses an image processing method wherein a dialog box allows the setting of an aspect ratio corresponding to a print size (column 23, lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose as modified wherein the editing processes include designating an aspect ratio. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose as modified by the teaching of Kubo in order to improve image processing.

With respect to claims 19 and 39 Momose as modified differs from claims 19 and 39 in that he does not clearly disclose that the selection condition is magnetic information which is stored such that the magnetic information is linked to image information. Kubo discloses being able to select magnetic information (which reads on panorama) (figure 10) and that the magnetic

Art Unit: 2622

information is linked to image information (column 1, lines 10-15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose as modified wherein the selection condition is magnetic information which is stored such that the magnetic information is linked to image information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Momose as modified by the teaching of Kubo in order to improve image processing.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 21, and 41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. All claims are rejected.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE

Art Unit: 2622

OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mark Wallerson